

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

**GILA COUNTY, ARIZONA**

Date: October 18, 2005

**JOSÉ M. SANCHEZ**

Chairman

**STEVEN L. BESICH**

Clerk of the Board

**TOMMIE C. MARTIN**

Vice-Chairman

By: Marilyn Brewer

Deputy Clerk

**SHIRLEY L. DAWSON**

Member

Gila County Courthouse  
Globe, Arizona

---

PRESENT: Jose M. Sanchez, Chairman; Tommie C. Martin, Vice-Chairman; Shirley L. Dawson, Member; Steven L. Besich, County Manager/Clerk; Marian Sheppard, Chief Deputy Clerk; and, Bryan Chambers, 2<sup>nd</sup> Chief Deputy County Attorney.

The Gila County Board of Supervisors met in Regular Session at 10:00 a.m. this date. Vice-Chairman Martin led the Pledge of Allegiance, and Jeremy Goodman delivered the Invocation.

Dixie Mundy, Elections Director, requested the adoption of an Order changing a portion of the boundary that divides the Payson #5 and Star Valley voting precincts pursuant to Arizona Revised Statutes § 16-411. She presented maps of the area stating that the maps used are from the U.S. Census Bureau which are sometimes outdated so all of the changes are not reflected. Ms. Mundy explained that the areas of concern lie within the lot addresses of 1402 and 1403 East Eagletree Lane located in the Oak Ridge Hill Subdivision. There is no structure on lot 1402, and lot 1403, which is east and south of 1402, does have a structure. She stated that certified letters advising of the proposed changes were mailed to the owners, who both reside in Scottsdale. Nothing was received back from either owner. In research, Ms. Mundy found the owners are not registered voters in Gila County. She pointed out on the maps

both the current and proposed precinct boundaries. Ms. Mundy stated that instead of defining the name of the boundary, she would like to change the Order to read, as follows: “Whereas, changing a portion of the precinct boundary as defined in the attached map, will result in the parcels of property located at 1402 E. Eagletree Lane and 1403 E. Eagletree Lane to lie within the Payson #5 voting precinct.” Instead of naming the boundaries, she requested that the Order refer to the attached map. The Order would become effective upon adoption by the Board. Vice-Chairman Martin made the motion to adopt the Order as presented by Ms. Mundy approving changing a portion of the boundary that divides the Payson #5 and Star Valley voting precincts. The motion was seconded by Supervisor Dawson, and the Board unanimously adopted the Order. **(A copy of the Order is permanently on file in the Board of Supervisors’ Office.)**

At 10:13 a.m., a public hearing was held in which Ms. Mundy requested the adoption of an Order approving boundary changes to Miami #3, Miami #5, and Claypool #3 voting precincts pursuant to Arizona Revised Statutes §16-411. She stated that the subject boundary changes are within Supervisorial District No. 2 so there would be no change in demographics or population distribution among the 3 Supervisorial Districts. Ms. Mundy stated that this consolidation places the east portion of the Town of Miami that currently lies in Miami #5 precinct into the Miami #3 precinct; it also places the remaining area of Miami #5 into the Claypool #3 precinct. She stated that a public hearing notice, although not required by statute for boundary changes, was published in both English and Spanish in the Arizona Silver Belt and the Copper Basin News so that the people in the affected communities would know about the meeting and have the opportunity to respond. Ms. Mundy stated that she also contacted the chairmen of the Gila County Democratic Party and the Gila County Republican Committee. She presented a map of the existing precinct layout as it currently appears. In reference to the Miami #3 precinct, currently a portion of the voters lie within the Town of Miami, while another portion

resides outside the Town of Miami limits. This is called a split precinct meaning that within a voting precinct, jurisdictional boundaries divide the voters into different election categories. She then presented a map of the proposed changes. Ms. Mundy stated this consolidation would eliminate the Miami #5 precinct. The Miami #3 precinct boundary would extend east and follow the Town of Miami boundary. Currently, for the Town of Miami elections, the residents vote at the Miami Town Hall, but in County elections, Miami #5 precinct votes at the First Baptist Church in Claypool, and Miami #3 precinct votes at the Miami Town Hall. This requires voters to cast their ballots in two different polling places, which is confusing. She stated the advantage would be that by extending Miami #3 to include all the citizens within the Town of Miami, that would unify that portion of the Town of Miami, so regardless of the election, all voters in Miami would vote at the Miami Town Hall. The Miami Town Hall building meets all ADA (American Disabilities Act) requirements. Ms. Mundy stated that the remaining voters of Miami #5 precinct, outside the Town of Miami limits, would be incorporated into the Claypool #3 precinct. She stated that the voters of Miami #5 precinct have been voting at the First Baptist Church in Claypool, which is not ADA compliant. The polling place for Claypool #3 precinct will be at the Gila County Facilities Management Building (Old National Guard Armory), which is ADA compliant. With the Help America Vote Act, ADA compliance is becoming a priority not only with the handicapped community, but with the federal government as well. Vice-Chairman Martin inquired as to the number of people being affected by this change. Ms Mundy presented the population statistics to the Board based on the most recent census, before the consolidated changes and then after the proposed changes. She also showed a slide of the voter registration as of October 2005, before the proposed changes, which are as follows: Claypool #3 precinct has 379 voters; Miami #3 precinct has 299 voters; and, Miami #5 precinct has 499 voters. She also showed a breakdown of Miami #5 precinct by voter which showed that in the Town of Miami there are 295 registered voters and outside the Town there

are 204 voters. After the proposed changes, Claypool #3 precinct would have 583 voters and Miami #3 precinct would have 594 voters. Supervisor Dawson inquired if the County Recorder is in agreement with the proposed changes. Ms. Mundy stated that the Recorder is in agreement. At this time Chairman Sanchez called for public comment; none was offered. Chairman Sanchez closed the public hearing and asked for a motion. Upon motion by Supervisor Dawson, seconded by Vice Chairman Martin, the Board unanimously adopted the Order approving the Miami #3 precinct, Miami #5 precinct and Claypool #3 precinct boundary changes. **(A copy of the Order is permanently on file in the Board of Supervisors' Office.)**

At 10:31 a.m. a public hearing was held whereby Ms. Mundy requested adoption of changes to the County policy, fee schedule and intergovernmental agreement (IGA) with regard to the conduct of district elections. She stated that before the adoption of the fee for service, the County must hold a public hearing which is noticed 15 days prior. The hearing was posted in the Arizona Silver Belt on September 28, 2005, and in the Payson Roundup on September 27, 2005. The purpose for amending the policy, fee schedule and the IGA is primarily because of the new optical scan voting system and also because of statutory changes. Ms. Mundy stated that there are 39 special taxing districts, including schools, in the County that require elections. The County Elections Department conducts elections for 38 of the 39 districts; the Northern Gila County Sanitary District conducts its own elections. Ms. Mundy explained the ballot styles needed for each precinct when elections for special districts are consolidated with the general election. She stated that one of the reasons for the fee increases is the expense for the County programming, proofing and candidate filing. She then reviewed the proposed policy, fee schedule and IGA changes. Ms. Mundy explained one new addition to the policy that may cause some concern with the school districts, especially on override elections, which are held in March or May. She stated that it is proposed that elections conducted that are not in consolidation with the County election will be done

by an “all vote by mail.” Arizona Revised Statutes allow districts, cities and towns to conduct their elections by all mail; however, counties do not have this authority. Ms. Mundy stated that the reason for this proposal is that elections for special districts are not consolidated with the County elections. By changing the policy, this will alert the special districts about this plan so they will know that future elections will be by mail. She stated that an advantage by mail is that every voter on file with the Recorder’s office in that jurisdiction will receive a ballot. Traditionally special elections in the spring have a low voter turnout, so this could possibly increase voting. Supervisor Dawson inquired if this would apply to school bond elections. Ms. Mundy stated that all school bond elections are held in November. She stated if the County is having an election in a particular even year, the school bond election would be held at the same time as the County election; however, during odd-numbered years the school bond elections would be by all mail, unless the Board wished to stipulate otherwise in the policy. Ms. Mundy advised that another new addition to the policy is in regard to water and wastewater district elections. By statute, the owner of real property, regardless of residency, may vote in that water district election as long as they are registered in the State of Arizona. The water district board must notify the nonresident of the election. Vice-Chairman Martin inquired if the fees have increased substantially. Ms. Mundy replied that the fees have not increased substantially, but had to be changed because of additional requirements for the optical scan voting. She stated that Gila County is in the “center” of the fee schedule when compared with other counties. Supervisor Dawson stated that the public may not be aware that when petitions are filed with the Recorder for a special election, or an election not held in consolidation with a county wide election, there is not only the \$1.25 per registered voter fee (as shown in the Fee Schedule), but also an additional charge of \$.50 per signature for the Recorder’s Office to certify that signature. If more signatures are filed than are necessary, a fee will be charged for each signature filed. She suggested that perhaps Ms. Mundy could put

together a pamphlet showing all costs, which could be given to those people wanting to call a special election. Vice-Chairman Martin requested that this information also be made available on the County's website. At this time, Chairman Sanchez called for public comment. Linda O'Dell, County School Superintendent, stated that in reference to the all mail ballot, she has not polled the school superintendents, but she believes they may have some unease about the all mail ballot. Ms. O'Dell stated that the all mail ballot is less expensive and provides better access for all the voters, and "*this is a new century and a new time, and we should give it a try.*" Chairman Sanchez closed the public hearing and asked for a motion. Upon motion by Vice-Chairman Martin, seconded by Supervisor Dawson, the Board unanimously adopted the changes to the County policy, fee schedule and IGA. **(Copies of the Policy, Fee Schedule and IGA are permanently on file in the Board of Supervisors' Office.)**

Ms. Mundy requested the Board of Supervisors' approval to not implement the voter identification requirements at the polls for the Whiteriver Unified School District #20 Special Bond Election to be held on November 8, 2005. She stated that the Arizona Secretary of State is responsible for preparing submission to the U.S. Justice Department to implement the identification requirement at the voting polls, which is the affect of Proposition 200 passed by Arizona voters last year. The problem with the pre-clearance that the U.S. Justice Department issues if they do not object to the change was that it was not received back by the State until October 7, 2005. Ms. Mundy stated that one month would not allow the counties ample time to inform voters of the significant change to the voting process or prepare forms. A poll was conducted among the counties who will be holding elections in November, and Apache County is the only county that is going to try the implementation. Ms. Mundy stated that one election will be held this year on November 8, 2005, by the Whiteriver School District which is comprised of the Canyon Day and Carrizo precincts, and it would be difficult to adequately inform those voters on

such short notice. She requested that Gila County not implement the identification requirement until 2006. Supervisor Dawson inquired if the Indian reservation identification card would be an adequate form of identification at the polls under Proposition 200. Ms. Mundy stated that the San Carlos Apache Tribe and the White Mountain Apache Tribe issue cards with adequate information; however, the problem with any identification card is that the information on the identification card must exactly match the information on the voter registration card, which she believes may cause some problems. Mr. Besich stated that next Friday a meeting will be held with Daisy Flores, County Attorney, Linda Ortega, County Recorder and Ms. Mundy, so that group can make a presentation to the Board, as well as other organizations, on the impact of Proposition 200. He stated that people need to know they need a driver's license for identification purposes even if they don't drive. If people show up to vote without proper identification, they will be able to vote with a provisional ballot, but they are then required to present valid identification at the Recorder's Office within 7 days after the election in order for the vote to be counted. He also stated that valid picture identification must have been issued after 1996, so those people with long-term licenses issued before 1996 will not be accepted. Ms. Mundy stated that there are so many types of identification cards that it will be a difficult educational process. Upon motion by Supervisor Dawson, seconded by Vice-Chairman Martin, the Board unanimously voted not to implement the voter identification requirements for the 2005 election.

At 11:09 a.m. Chairman Sanchez called for a brief recess.

At 11:18 a.m. Chairman Sanchez reconvened the meeting.

Steve Stratton, Public Works Division Director, along with guest speakers Richard "Rick" Powers, Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) Globe District Engineer, and Ingo Radicke, consultant to Gila County, gave an update on ADOT projects which pertain to the Globe District. Mr. Powers gave a brief PowerPoint update on information presented to the Board several months prior.

He stated that projected in the five-year program for 2008, ADOT will be spending \$2.9 billion on projects, which will have a tremendous economic impact on the entire state. He stated that the traffic growth in this area has increased and growth is coming this way although *“we haven’t seen the brunt of it yet.”* In reference to corridor improvements, Mr. Powers stated that a dedication ceremony was held for the completion of a section of State Route (SR) 188, which is scheduled to open today or tomorrow. The old roadway will be milled and transported to the dirt portion of Roadway 88. He then showed an updated map identifying the U.S. Highway 60 Corridor Improvements from Florence Junction to Superior, particularly Gonzales Pass. The U.S. 60 Corridor Planning Project has been divided into 7 segments, with two of the segments not yet funded, which are the Superior Section #6 and Queen Valley Section TI. In the interim there are some climbing lanes being constructed at Pinto Valley and by Oak Flats coming out of Devil’s Canyon. A Final Feasibility Report has been completed for the route from Superior, Mile Post (MP) 226, to Globe, MP 252, with some adjustments. This project has been broken down into 5 segments with the focus on the segments entering Miami. Mr. Powers stated that he receives a lot of questions about the concern of bypassing Globe, but there’s not enough funding to do that at this time, even if ADOT agrees with bypassing Globe. ADOT does recognize the safety concerns on the segment between Superior and Miami so ADOT wants to tie into the 4 or 5-lane section and get a divided roadway from the outskirts of Miami to Superior and then ultimately to Phoenix. Mr. Powers then showed a map of the existing roadway and the 3 proposed alignments. He stated that ADOT is working with Resolution Copper Company to route the roadway where it would not be in conflict with the mine. He stated that ADOT’s goal is to use as much of the current highway as possible to keep costs down, and then add a new lane of traffic. Mr. Powers stated that future projects included in the FY 2006-2010 program include an additional \$12 million for the U.S. 60 Picket Post to Superior segment; \$3.4 million for the U.S. 70 railroad underpass project; and,



passing lanes on SR 260 from Heber to Show Low. He also briefly spoke on the growth of Pinal County that will eventually impact Gila County. Mr. Powers concluded his presentation by stating that all of this information and more information is available on ADOT's website at <http://www.azdot.gov/Highways/districts/Globe/index.asp>. He then introduced Ingo Radicke. Mr. Radicke stated that his goal as Gila County's consultant for traffic is to see that these projects get done. He stated that the last phase of the U.S. 60 project from the Arboretum to Superior is another \$11 million project that he's trying to get into ADOT's plan for 2011. He's not sure if that will happen because ADOT is out of money as all of the recent projects have been coming in 25-30% over budget. Mr. Radicke stated that it was just learned that the Gonzales Pass project of \$40 million will require an additional \$8 million to complete. He discussed with the Board about his ongoing efforts to get other projects funded, *"but nothing happens very fast."* Supervisor Dawson expressed a concern about the high cost of new roads because of all the environmental requirements. She stated that *"no one has taken an environmental stand that enough is enough"* and asked for input on these environmental requirements with which ADOT must abide. Mr. Radicke replied that the challenge is that too many people make a living in the environmental business. He stated, *"ADOT is not real happy about it, but it is beyond ADOT's control and must follow federal mandates, and it does raise the cost and cause delays of projects."* Mr. Powers added that another issue is that much of the land is owned by the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) and because ADOT needs the land for new highways, ADOT has to work closely with the USFS for the benefit of the public. He stated that ADOT has been hit with some fines and violations, so they are forced to focus on the environmental issues to avoid penalties for noncompliance. Supervisor Dawson stated that at the USFS hearing held in Young, the USFS representatives were non-responsive to the people in attendance and stated that *"the regulations are not their regulations,"* or *"it's out of our hands."* She stated, *"All of these regulations*

*got placed in here by those who love nature or whatever it is. We all love nature, but we also need to figure out how to cut some costs and how to get the most we can out of the funds. I believe we ought to save the habitat and save the animals, but with reasonable guidelines. I think that's part of what the USFS needs to hear. If it's our Congress people that need to hear it also, we need the support of getting reasonable regulations rather than having a mine spend \$50 million trying to open and having to walk away from it eventually."*

Chairman Sanchez stated that he likes this relationship with Mr. Radicke staying on top of all the ADOT projects, and Mr. Powers keeping the Board apprised on same. Mr. Stratton also added his appreciation for being kept informed on the Pinal County projects that will integrate with Gila County.

At noon, Vice-Chairman Martin stated that she needed to leave the meeting as she had a legislative committee meeting she needed to attend.

Marian Sheppard, Chief Deputy Clerk, addressed agenda item number 7, which has 3 components related to liquor licenses. She requested to present all 3 items and then have the Board make a motion on items b) and c) of agenda item number 7. She stated that section a) is in reference to a new statute, A.R.S. §4-203.F, which went into effect on August 11, 2005. This statute addresses licensure requirements when a person other than those persons originally issued a liquor license acquires control over a license or licensee. The new language of the statute is as follows: "If a person other than those persons originally licensed acquires control over a license or licensee, the personal shall file notice of the acquisition with the Director within fifteen days after such acquisition of control and a list of officers, directors or other controlling persons on a form prescribed by the Director." The State then has fifteen days to forward the application to the local governing body. The statute outlines the local governing body's responsibility, as follows: "The local governing body of the city, town, or county may protest the acquisition of control within sixty days (of the date the application was submitted to the State) on the capability, reliability and qualification of the person acquiring

control. If the Director does not receive any protests, the Director may protest the acquisition of control or approve the acquisition of control based on the capability, reliability and qualifications of the person acquiring control.” Ms. Sheppard stated that in conversations with the Arizona Department of Liquor Licenses and Control (ADLLC) representative, it has been determined that this law and the application process are both flawed. The ADLLC has received numerous complaints, so changes are anticipated in the near future. The State only wants to receive written notification from the local governing board if there is a protest to the application. Ms. Sheppard gave the following background information as to how this new law came about, as follows: This law was initiated by bigger municipalities that conduct background checks on those individuals who apply for liquor licenses. It was found that a license transfer could take affect when, for example, a corporation changed to a limited liability corporation. The clients/partners of the business would change and no one would know. In reality the license was being transferred; however, the State, city, town or county weren’t being notified. Also, the municipalities realized that they were losing out on any fees that are charged for a transfer of a liquor license. Ms. Sheppard advised that she received the first agent change application in all of the Arizona counties. As there are no guidelines provided by the State on the internal review process to be conducted by the local governing board, Ms. Sheppard stated that she initially planned to handle this application in the same manner as the liquor license applications; however, the State representative advised that there is not enough time. For a normal liquor license application, the process from the time the person applies until the ADLLC Board issues a decision is 105 days. For this type of application under the new law, the State cannot make a decision before 60 days from the date of the application and most likely a decision will be made on the 61<sup>st</sup> day. This would not allow enough time for all the internal County procedures and the posting of a notice at the business for 20 days. Ms. Sheppard then presented section b) of this agenda item, the proposed Board of Supervisors’ procedure to

process applications which apply to this new statute. She stated that the proposed procedure was reviewed by the other Arizona County Clerks who agreed this is a good process. Ms. Sheppard stated that one primary issue is that the larger counties conduct their own internal investigation on the applicants; however, Gila County does not conduct an internal investigation because of the cost and lack of manpower, and because the ADLLC also does its own investigation through the Department of Public Safety or the Federal Bureau of Investigation, so it is redundant. She stated that the local governing board merely issues a recommendation to the ADLLC Board, which means the ADLLC Board can override the decision of the Board of Supervisors. She stated that the new policy calls for the placement of a notice at the business for 10 days and then an item is placed on the Board's Regular Board agenda so if the public has any opposition they can be heard at that time. Ms. Sheppard then addressed section c) of this agenda item which was an application received from the Cobre Valle Country Club (CVCC) requesting to change the agent from Julie Zupancic to Joseph Thorbecke. She stated that the definition of an agent is the contact person for the State, and that person must be a United States citizen and a resident of Arizona. A notice was published at the CVCC for 10 days, and no comments or opposition were received. Chairman Sanchez inquired if Gila County charges a fee. Ms. Sheppard replied that no fees are charged for any liquor license application, but the Board may want to consider charging fees in the future as more counties are moving in that direction. Supervisor Dawson stated that she can't imagine why the County isn't charging a fee. She also inquired about only posting the notice at the place of business. Her concern was that a person opposed to this agent change most likely would not frequent the business. Ms. Sheppard replied that this isn't a liquor license application; this is just an agent change to an existing liquor license. She stated that the process is flawed because even the application doesn't contain enough information for any board to issue a decision based on that person's capability, reliability and qualifications. Upon motion by Supervisor Dawson,

seconded by Chairman Sanchez, the Board adopted the Clerk of the Board procedure to process applications which apply to the new statute. Upon motion by Supervisor Dawson, seconded by Chairman Sanchez, the Board approved the application submitted by the CVCC.

Ms. Sheppard requested approval of a Series 9 Liquor Store License, Gila County Order #LL 05-05, submitted by Kim Kwiatkowski for Circle K Stores, Inc., Store #6670, located in Star Valley. She stated that Kim Kwiatkowski is taking the liquor license from the Circle K Store in Payson, which is being closed, to a Circle K Store in Star Valley. There were no problems with the permitting issues from the County's internal process; therefore, Ms. Sheppard recommended approval by the Board. Upon motion by Supervisor Dawson, seconded by Chairman Sanchez, the Board approved the Series 9 Liquor Store License for Circle K Stores, Inc., Store #6670, located in Star Valley.

Steve Besich requested Board discussion on any new items in reference to Gila County water issues. He stated that he had no new updates at this time. Supervisor Dawson stated that the Diamond Star Water Coalition hired a hydrologist and in his report he stated that the old dumpsite is not a potential contaminant to the Star Valley water. She stated that he also said that if the Randall Haught well is pumped as proposed, it will de-water Star Valley. She stated that the Town of Payson totally agrees that the dump won't contaminate the water, but they totally disagree that it will use up Star Valley's water supply. She stated that if the Board did not have a copy of the report, she would provide one. No action was taken by the Board.

Upon motion by Supervisor Dawson, seconded by Chairman Sanchez, the Board voted to change the Resolution number under Consent Agenda Item No. B from 05-10-05, which was a typing error, to 05-10-06.

Upon motion by Supervisor Dawson, seconded by Chairman Sanchez, the Board approved the Consent Agenda items A-G, as follows:

- A. Acknowledged the resignation of Bruce A. Parke as a governing board member of the Pine Creek Canyon Domestic Water Improvement District

and the appointment of Brian Reinke to complete the unexpired term of Mr. Parke.

- B. Adopted Resolution No. 05-10-06 naming a road in Tonto Basin to be called Riverview Lane, a road in Young to be called Twins Trail, and two roads in El Capitan area to be called Craigend Way and Ranch Creek Road. **(A copy of the Resolution is permanently on file in the Board of Supervisors' Office.)**
- C. Approved ratification of the Chairman's signature on SFY 2006 LTAF II Grant Application Form submitted to the Arizona Department of Transportation requesting funds in the amount of \$25,592.91, which if approved will be used for various transportation programs throughout Gila County.
- D. Approved Amendment No. 2 to Contract #E5344530 between the Arizona Department of Economic Security Vocational Rehabilitation and Gila Employment and Special Training (GEST) in the amount of \$163,000, which will allow for the continued provision of services to Gila County disabled clients through March 9, 2006.
- E. Approved the September 2005 monthly departmental activity reports submitted by the Payson and Globe Regional Justices of the Peace, and the Payson Regional Constable.
- F. Approved the personnel reports/actions for the week of October 17, 2005, as follows:

Departure from County Service:

- 1. Legal Clerk/Courtroom Clerk – Clerk of Superior Court – 10-03-05 – General Fund - Robyn Kidwell – Hire 01-15-03 – Resigned – leaving area
- 2. Clerk – Clerk of Superior Court – 08-05-05 – Document Conversion Fund Joy Rivera-Wilson – temporary position

Departmental Transfer:

- 3. Juvenile Detention Officer I to Deputy Probation Officer – Probation – 10-11-05 – General Fund – Larry Pontel

4. Juvenile Detention Officer I to Surveillance Officer – Probation – 10-11-05 – General to AIPS/JIPS Funds – Robert Beraun

Position Review:

5. Anniversary Date Increase and Fund Code Change – Emergency Planning & Operations Coordinator – Emergency Management – 10-17-05 – Emergency Operations Planning Fund – Debra Williams

Request Permission to Post:

6. Personnel Assistant – Personnel – Approved position never filled

**SHERIFF'S PERSONNEL ACTION ITEMS**

Departure from County Service:

7. Detention Officer – Globe S.O. – 10-11-05 – General Fund - Adonia Lomayaktewa – Hire 04-18-05 – Failure to complete probationary period

G. Approved the finance reports/demands/transfers for the week of October 17, 2005 (separate handout), as follows: \$715,985.93 was disbursed for County expenses by voucher numbers X147669 through X147747, X374044 through X374278, and X374280 through X374281. There were no hand-issued warrants. **(An itemized list of vouchers is permanently on file in the Board of Supervisors.)**

At this time each Board member and the Chief Administrator were presented the opportunity to give a brief summary of current events as allowed by A.R.S. §38-431.02(K).

There being no further business to come before the Board, Chairman Sanchez adjourned the meeting at 12:24 p.m.

---

Jose M. Sanchez, Chairman

ATTEST:

---

Steven L. Besich, County Manager/Clerk